UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 35

Application Number: 09/207,945
Filing Date: December 09, 1998
Appellant(s): NGUYEN ET AL.

D. Randal Ayers
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 12/08/2003.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17, 19-23, 34-36, 38-42, 44-51, 53-55 and 57 are stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

5,999,912	WODARZ ET AL.	12-1999
6,108,637	BLUMENAU	08-2000
5,974,455	MONIER	10-1999
6,311,211 B1	SHAW ET AL.	10-2001

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> (b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17, 19-23, 25-32, 34-36, 38-42, 44-51, 53-55, and 57 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wodarz et al., US 5,999,912 filed 05/1997, in view of Monier, US 5,974,455 filed 12/1995, Blumenau et al., US 6,108,637 filed 09/1996, and Shaw et al., US 6,311,211 B1 priority filed 09/1998.

Regarding independent claim 1, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- generating a requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12 and page 3, table 1, Wodarz teaches generating a web page includes many ad objects. Each ad object having a unique identifier "Ad number" associated therewith); and
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page; and the unique identifier is generated via a hashing function.

Monier teaches unique identifier is generated via a hashing function along with each URL (Monier, col.5, lines 55-60 and fig.2).

It would have been obvious to a version of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Monier and Wodarz to provide an unique identifier for each advertisement using hash function, since the hash function was well known for providing a unique identifier of a piece of data.

Blumenau discloses the steps of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36); and
- appending the stored record of the user request with a unique URL identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page "can itself reference other files" which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and "an identification of the file requested" which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file).

However, Blumenau does not explicitly disclose appending the stored record of the user request with an advertisement identifier.

Shaw teaches a server system utilizes information in an user profile/event log file to determine which advertisements are displayed to particular user (Shaw, col.4, lines 40-58), and an id ad is logged in an ad log file for the server process (Shaw, col.11, lins 56-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Blumenau and Shaw to store information about an object content in a web page, such as "URL" and "id ad" of the object content in a log file, since these information would have help the system determine which advertisement eligible to particular user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Shaw, Blumenau into Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server to provide web pages which based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed "selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic" (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13), since storing "a record of the user request within a web server log" and advertisement identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page of Shaw and Blumenau would have helped the server keep track of the user's information and activities in order to decide which advertisement suitable to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz, Monier, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses wherein the record of the request includes information that identifies the user (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server provide web pages which meet the user's interest, since basing on user identifier, the server would be able to serve web pages to appropriate user's needs as Wodarz disclosed at col.2, lines 7-13.

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz, Monier, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses

the method according to claim 1 wherein the step of generating the requested web page comprises the steps of:

- retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-40);
- retrieving the content objects (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-62); and
- combining the content objects and the layout template to produce the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, line 35 – col.2, line 6).

Regarding dependent claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Wodarz, Monier, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitation of claim 3 as explained above. Wodarz discloses the method according to claim 3 wherein the content object is selected from the group of image files, hyperlinks (col.3, lines 55-61). However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the content object is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included that advertisement objects of Wodarz is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file, since it would have helped the generated web page more attractive to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz, Monier, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of a parser program using

algorithms to select appropriate ads (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-14), which implies the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine web content preferences of a user.

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz, Monier, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of appending the stored record of the user request with a time stamp for a subsequence user request for a web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server more accurately analyze the user's records to determine web content preferences of a user, since the more user's information a server captures, the better the quality of the statistics would have been.

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Wodarz, **Monier**, Blumenau and Shaw teach the limitations of claim 7 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of determining a length of time the user views the generated web page using the time stamp within the store record (Blumenau, col.13, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz, and Blumenau to provide more criteria for Wodarz's parser program to select ads to provide to the client, since the server knows what the users' interests are, based on how long the user spent to view the web page.

Regarding independent claim 9, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- generating the requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes first and second content objects having respective unique first and second identifiers associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12 and page 3, table 1, Wodarz teaches generating a web page includes many ad objects. Each ad object having a unique identifier "Ad number" associated therewith);
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15);
- retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-40);
- retrieving the first and second content objects (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-62, retrieve many advertisement objects); and
- combining the first and second content objects and the layout template to produce the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, line 35 – col.2, line 6, combing many advertisement objects and layout template to generate the requested web page).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifiers associated with the content objects included within the generated web page; and the unique first and second identifiers are generated via a hashing function.

Monier teaches unique identifier is generated via a hashing function along with each URL (Monier, col.5, lines 55-60 and fig.2).

It would have been obvious to a version of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Monier and Wodarz to provide an unique identifier for each advertisement using hash function, since the hash function was well known for providing a unique identifier of a piece of data.

Blumenau discloses the steps of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36); and
- appending the stored record of the user request with a URL unique identifiers associated with the content objects included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page "can itself reference other files" which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and "an identification of the file requested" for each single file request which means that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that the first and second URL identifiers of files requests (objects requests) must be added to the log file when the user requests such files.

However, Blumenau does not explicitly disclose appending the stored record of the user request with advertisement first and second identifiers.

Shaw teaches a server system utilizes information in an user profile/event log file to determine which advertisements are displayed to particular user (Shaw, col.4, lines 40-58), and an id ad is logged in an ad log file for the server process (Shaw, col.11, lins 56-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Blumenau and Shaw to store information about an object content in a web page, such as "URL" and "id ad" of the object content in a log file, since these information would have help the system determine which advertisement eligible to particular user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Shaw, Blumenau into Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server to provide web pages which based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed "selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic" (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13), since storing "a record of the user request within a web server log" and advertisement identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page of Shaw and Blumenau would have helped the server keep track of the user's information and activities in order to decide which advertisement suitable to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 10, claim 10 includes limitations of claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 11, claim 11 includes limitations of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 12, claim 12 includes limitations of claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 13, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- associating dynamically generated web page content with a user who requests a web page from a web server via a web client in communication with the web server (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-52) comprising the steps of:
- generating a requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12 and page 3, table 1, Wodarz teaches generating a web page includes many ad objects. Each ad object having a unique identifier "Ad number" associated therewith); and
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page; and the unique identifier is generated via a hashing function.

Monier teaches unique identifier is generated via a hashing function along with each URL (Monier, col.5, lines 55-60 and fig.2).

It would have been obvious to a version of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Monier and Wodarz to provide an unique identifier for each advertisement using hash function, since the hash function was well known for providing a unique identifier of a piece of data.

Blumenau discloses the steps of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36); and
- appending the stored record of the user request with a unique URL identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page "can itself reference other files" which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and "an identification of the file requested" which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file).

However, Blumenau does not explicitly disclose appending the stored record of the user request with advertisement identifier.

Shaw teaches a server system utilizes information in an user profile/event log file to determine which advertisements are displayed to particular user (Shaw, col.4, lines 40-58), and an id ad is logged in an ad log file for the server process (Shaw, col.11, lins 56-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Blumenau and Shaw to store information about an object

content in a web page, such as "URL" and "id ad" of the object content in a log file, since these information would have help the system determine which advertisement eligible to particular user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Shaw, Blumenau into Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server to provide web pages which based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed "selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic" (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13), since storing "a record of the user request within a web server log" and advertisement identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page of Shaw and Blumenau would have helped the server keep track of the user's information and activities in order to decide which advertisement suitable to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 15, claim 15 includes limitations of claim 2. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 2, wherein the record of the request includes information that identifies the user is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding dependent claim 16, claim 16 includes limitations of claim 3. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 3, wherein retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page; retrieving the content objects; and combining the content objects and the layout template to produce the requested web page are addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding dependent claim 17, claim 17 includes limitation of claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 4, wherein the content object is selected from the group consisting of text file, audio files, video files, image files and hyperlinks is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding dependent claim 19, claim 19 includes limitation of claim 6. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 6, the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine Web content preference of a user is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Claims 20-23, 25-32, 34-36, and 38 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 39-42, 44-51, 53-55, and 57 are for a computer program performing the method of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

(11) Response to Argument

GROUP I CLAIMS

A. "<u>The Cited Art Does Not Teach Appending The Unique Identifier For a Content Object to the Stored Record of a User Request</u>".

Regarding claims 1-4, 7, 13, 15-17, 20-23, 26, 32, 34-36, 39-42, 45, 51 and 53-55, Appellants argue on page 4-6 that invention's claim recites that "the unique identifiers that are

associated with the content object are **appended to the record in the log fie of the user original request for a Web page**" and "**no record whatsoever** will be recorded of the request for the 'other files' " (emphasized by Appealant).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Blumenau teaches upon receiving a request from a client computer for a web page, a web server transfers the requested file to the client (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-24). If the requested file references other files (content objects), which are stored at the web server or on other server computer, the requested file and these other files are transferred to content display for generating a display of the requested web page to the client (Blumenau, col.2, lines 24-30, "This file can itself reference other files ... that are also transferred to the content display site"). Blumenau teaches the server requests and transfers appropriate **file** in case the requested web page does not reference to other files, or requests and transfers appropriate **files** in case the requested web page reference to other files; and also recording such server-requests for files (appropriate file or files) in a log file which is used to store identification of the file requested (Blumenau, col.2, lines 28-36 and 39-44, "The record of such requests is stored ... as a 'log file' "). These indicate that the requested web page and other files (content objects) are stored in a log file as taught by Blumenau is not different from "appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page" of the instant invention's claimed.

Blumenau further clarifies the example indicated above at col.2, lines 20-52 that, upon receiving a request for a web page from a client, the server requests the requested web page (initial html file) and the other files (content objects) to generate a display of the requested web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 63-66). Blumenau teaches additional recording such request for the

other files to the log file (Blumenau, col.2, line 66 – col.3, line 1). Blumenau teaches recording such request for files (initial html and other files) in a log file resulting "a request for a single Web page can cause multiple transaction to be recorded in the log file" (Blumenau, col.3, lines 1-3) wherein each transaction represents a single file request (Blumenau, col.2, lines 39-40). These, again confirm that in order to generate a display of the requested web page, additional transactions are recorded in the log file for other files, besides the requested web page. In other words, the identification of the other requested files (content objects) are appended to the log file with the stored record of user requested web page. Moreover, Blumenau clearly points out that it is possible to verify the other files (content objects), which are used to generate the client-requested web page, by analyzing transactions in the log file (Blumenau, col.3, lines 15-22). In fact, this proves that, Blumenau's log file stores identifications/information of other files (content objects) and the client-requested web page (users original request for a web page).

Appellants appear to argue that their claimed invention differs from Blumenau by appending the unique identifiers associated with the content objects to the **separately** stored record (log) of each user or something along this line. The fact is that Appellants' claims do not clearly point out what/how their user's "stored record" differs from Blumenau's log, where Blumenau also stores the unique identifiers of the content objects associated with the requested page. As Blumenau's teachings cover the Appellants' claim limitations.

B. "There is No Motivation to Combine the Cited References"

Motivation for combining Blumenau and Wodarz

Beginning at page 7 through page 8 of the Appeal Brief, Appellants argue that "Wodarz contains no suggestion whatsoever that the advertisement would be selected based on a store record of content objects that had previously been requested by the user" (Appeal Brief, page 8, the second last sentence of second paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wodarz teaches, besides selecting advertisements that are to be displayed based on "user-specific characteristics" such as age, sex, language, etc. which is considered as **physical characteristics** (emphasized by the Appellants) of the user as Appellants point out in the Appeal brief, page 8, second paragraph as well as by the Examiner in the final office action, that the selection of ads also based on a "generated list of eligible candidates, such as: a "least recently viewed" algorithm; ... the maximum number of times that an ad has been viewed in a specific time period" (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13). Wodarz further discloses advantages' his invention, such as "track[ing] the number of times an ad is viewed" (Wodarz, col.2, lines16-17) when the viewer clicks on the ad (Wodarz, col.2, lines 1-3). Thus, Wodarz highly suggests the use of log file to track users' activities or behaviors to know what advertisement and how many times the advertisement has been viewed in order to select advertisements to provide to the users. Further a combination of Blumenau and Wodarz by any skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made would have certainly used Blumenau's user request records to feed into Wodarz's algorithms to extract further information regarding a user.

At the end of page 8 of the Appeal Brief, Appellants argue that Shaw "fails to requisite motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Both Blumenau and Shaw teach the use of log file to store information. Blumenau's log file is used to store identifications of a client-requested web page and files embedded (Blumenau, col.2, lines 24-25 and 42-43, "file can itself reference other files") in the web page as explained above. Shaw teaches, besides using member profile to determine what advertisement to provide to the user (Shaw, col.3, lines 39-43) as specifying by the Appellants, information in a log file is used to determine appropriate advertisement for users or particular user (Shaw, col.4, lines 40-58).

Shaw also teaches log file is used to store identification of the banner advertisement, the time and date it was displayed (Shaw, col.13, lines 64-67). Shaw's log file stores information, such as identifications of the advertisements embedded in a web page. Blumenau's log file stores information, such as identifications of embedded files (content objects) as discussed above. Both Shaw and Blumenau highly provide motivation for combination so to store in the log file identification of advertisements.

Beginning of page 9 of Appeal Brief, Appellants argue that "Blumenau also fails to provide any motivation to combine the teachings of Blunenau and Wodarz".

Referencing to the beginning of the section B of this Examiner Answer, Wodarz highly suggests the use of log file to track users' activities or behaviors to know what advertisement and how many times the advertisement has been viewed in order to select advertisements to provide to the users as explained. Examiner agrees that the cited portions of Blumenau in the Final Office Action are "taken from the "Backgroud of the Invention" of Blumenau and describe a prior art system". This, however, does not give an improper for the combination of Wodarz with

the teaching of prior art in Blumenau reference. Although, Blumenau points out disadvantage of this prior art, that log file information is inaccurate regarding a number of times that a web page is viewed as Appellant addressed in the Appeal Brief. This does not stop or discard advantages and teaching of storing information from user's activities or behavior in a log file to analyze and track these information for evaluating the effectiveness of advertisement what is taught by the prior art, even with weakness pointed out by Blumnenau to come up with other technique or method to overcome problems in the prior art.

Please note that the motivation to combine Wodarz and Blumenau also addressed in Wodarz as discussed at the beginning of section B (Wodarz highly suggests tracking users' activities or behaviors to know what advertisement and how many times the advertisement has been viewed in order to select advertisements to provide to the users).

Motivation for combining Wodarz and Monier

Appellants argue that there is no motivation to combine Monier into Wodarz.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wodarz teaches the step of serving advertisements that have unique identifiers to client content displays. Monier teaches, among other things, the step of using a hashing function to provide unique identifier to a URL (Monier, col.5, lines 55-60 and fig.2). They both thus teach the need of having unique identifiers to objects sent to client content display. Besides, hashing functions are also well known to any person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide unique identifiers to certain entities. It is obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to have looked for a way to generate unique identifier by using a hash function and modified it to combine into Wodarz in order to achieve Wodarz's

objective of having unique identifiers to each advertisements. Please further note that the use of four advertisements in Wodarz's example is obviously an example and could not possibly used to argue that a commercial system has only a handful of advertisements to display (as did Appellants').

GROUP II CLAIMS

Appellants further argue respect to claims 6, 12, 19, 25, 31, 44, 50, and 57 that "[n]othing in Wodarz even remotely suggests the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine web content preference of a user".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above and in the Final Office Action, the combination of Wodarz and Blumenau facilitates the server to decide suitable advertisements for users based on information of user request records in a log file. As mentioned in the Office Action and recognized by Appellants, Wodarz uses a variety of algorithms include those that analyze a user's characteristics such as age, sex, etc. (Wodarz, col.2 lines 7-14) which has been previously stored. These clearly suggest the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine web content preference of a user since a log of a user's request records provided by Blumenau clearly provides some other characteristics about a user. Any ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made could have modified Wodarz's parser algorithms to use Blumenau's stored user request records to select the (next) appropriate web contents (or advertisements) to send to the users.

GROUP III CLAIMS

Appellants further argue respect to claims 8, 27 and 46 that there is no reason to collect and use time stamp information in Wodarz system.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Wodarz's algorithms in combination with Blumenau's, select contents based on user's preferences, have many things to do with time stamp such as "least recent viewed", "time of day", "number of times that an ad has been viewed in a specific time", etc. (Wodarz, col.2 lines 7-13) and these are all based on the analyzing of the user request records. Adding another time-based criteria based on the same user request record as suggested by Blumenau is completely comprehensive and easy to do.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

TVH
February 21, 2004

Joseph Feild

Stephen Hong

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627